The Review.

FOUNDED, EDITED, AND PUBLISHED BY ARTHUR PREUSS.

VOL. XI. ST. LOUIS, MO., OCTOBER 6, 1904. NO. 38.

THE SINGLE TAX AS A SYSTEM OF TAXATION.*)

THE Henry George theory of land ownership has its practical application in the so-called "single tax." These two are inseparably connected. The former is the necessary scientific basis of the latter. Single tax men take a particular pride not only in having simplified or rather supplanted the complicated and expensive methods of taxation hitherto in vogue, but especially also in having discovered the only method that is based on nature and that therefore may rightly be called "natural taxation" or the "natural tax." However, since the scientific basis of this vaunted "natural tax" has been shown, in a previous series of papers in THE REVIEW, to be philosophically false and theologically heretical, the "natural tax" itself can not but be a mere phantom of the imagination, like the theory from which it springs.

The following extracts from Mr. George's "Open Letter" will give the reader the gist of his luminous and eloquent exposition of the subject.

"We propose, leaving land in the private possession [without ownership] of individuals, with full liberty on their part to give, sell or bequeath it, simply to levy on it for public uses a tax that shall equal the annual value of the land itself, irrespective of the use made of it or the improvements made on it. And since this would provide amply for the need of public revenues, we would accompany this tax on land values with the repeal of all taxes now

*) This article and a few more that will follow, are each one complete in itself; but for a thorough understanding of the entire question we would advise the reader to peruse them in connection with the following previously published papers: "Henry George and the Single Tax Theory," in No. 15 of the current volume of THE REVIEW; "Leo XIII. and Individual Land Ownership," in Nos. 16 and 17; "Henry George and Leo XIII.," in No. 18; "A Single Tax Encyclical," in No. 19; "The Arguments of Henry George Examined," in Nos. 21 and 22; and "Land Ownership and Revelation," in No. 23.

levied on the products and processes of industry—which taxes, since they take from the earnings of labor, we hold to be infringements of the right of property"....

"No sooner does the State arise than, as we all know, it needs revenues.... With the growth of population and advance of civilization the functions of the State increase and larger and larger revenues are needed. Now, He that made the world and placed man in it, He that preordained civilization as the means whereby man might rise to higher powers and become more and more conscious of the works of his Creator, must have foreseen the increasing need for State revenues and have made provision for it. That is to say: The increasing need for public revenues with social advance, being a natural, God-ordained need, there must be a right way of raising them—some way that we can truly say is the way intended by God. It is clear that this right way of raising public revenues must accord with the moral law.

"Hence: It must not take from individuals what rightfully belongs to individuals"—in other words: a rightful tax can not be one which is to be paid from the individual's rightful property or from his own pocket! Why not? Because "God can not contradict himself nor impose on his creatures laws that clash. If it be [therefore] God's command to men that they should not steal—that is to say, that they should respect the right of property which each one has in the fruits of his labor;" God can not have ordained that men should be deprived of part of their earnings or of their money in order to enable the State to carry on its various functions. But that is the case in "all taxes now levied on the products and processes of industry." Therefore we hear Henry George declare that he holds all those taxes, "since they take from the earnings of labor," to be unjust, "to be infringements of the right of property"!

This is forsooth a precious bit of modern economics! When the single tax system will once have been established, you will have to pay taxes, but not from your own money. And on the same principle that "God can not contradict himself," you will have to pay your physician in case of sickness, but never from your own pocket. Also your tailor, your baker, you grocer, etc., must not expect to be paid from your own money, since this would be an "infringement of the right of property." In the new era every one will always and everywhere "respect the right of property which each one has in the fruits of his labor"!

Henry George continues: "To consider what we propose—the raising of public revenues by a single tax on the value of land irrespective of improvements—is to see that in all respects this does conform to the moral law. Let me ask your Holiness"

(he is addressing Leo XIII.) "to keep in mind that the value we propose to tax, the value of land irrespective of improvements, does not come from any exertion of labor or investment of capital on or in it—the values produced in this way being values of improvements which we would exempt. The value of land irrespective of improvement is the value that attaches to land by reason of increasing population and social progress. This is a value that always goes to the owner as owner, and never does and never can go to the user; for if the user be a different person from the owner he must always pay the owner for it in rent or in purchase money; while if the user be also the owner, it is as owner, not as user, that he receives it, and by selling (?) or renting the land he can, as owner, continue to receive it after he ceases to be a user.

"Thus, taxes on land irrespective of improvement can not lessen the reward of industry, nor add to prices, nor in any way take from the individual what belongs to the individual." [That would be downright robbery!] "They can only take the value that attaches to land by the growth of the community, and which therefore belongs to the community as a whole.

"To take land values for the State, abolishing all taxes on the products of labor, would therefore leave to the laborer the full produce of labor, to the individual all that rightfully belongs to the individual."

This passage contains the whole justification Henry George can give and does give of the single tax. The land value is justly collected as a tax from every "possessor and user" of land for two reasons: 1. because the land value always goes to the owner as such; now the State or the community as such, not the individual, is the real owner of the land; hence the land value must go to the community or State; 2. the land value does not come from labor or from investment of capital, but arises merely from the growth of the community and from social progress; hence it belongs by right to the community or State. With these two reasons the justice of the single tax stands or falls. Here we have the crucial test.

The importance of this point, we think, will justify our adding to the quotations already given the following passage from 'Progress and Poverty.'

In Book VII., ch. III. (p. 262), Henry George, having cited this sentence from John Stuart Mill: "The land of Ireland, the land of every country, belongs to the people of that country. The individuals called land owners have no right in morality and justice to anything but the rent, or compensation for its salable value"—exclaims indignantly: "In the name of the Prophet—figs! If the land of any country belong to the people of that country, what

right, in morality and justice, have the individuals called land owners to the rent? If the land belong to the people, why in the name of morality and justice should the people pay its salable value for their own?"

Equally emphatic is his answer to the author of the synthetic philosophy. "Herbert Spencer says: 'Had we to deal with the parties who originally robbed the human race of its heritage, we might make short work of the matter.' Why not make short work of the matter anyhow? For this robbery is not like the robbery of a horse or of a sum of money, that ceases with the act. It is a fresh and continuous robbery, that goes on every day and every hour.....It is not merely a robbery in the past; it is a robbery in the present—a robbery that deprives of their birth-right the infants that are now coming into the world! Why should we hesitate about making short work of such a system?.....If the land belong to the people, why continue to permit land owners to take the rent, or compensate them in any manner for the loss of rent? Consider what rent is. It does not arise spontaneously from land; it is due to nothing that the land owners have done. It represents a value created by the whole community. Let the landholders have, if you please, all that the possession of the land would give them in the absence of the rest of the community. But rent, the creation of the whole community, necessarily belongs to the whole community."

Let us now consider the two reasons advanced by our economist with such eloquence and fervor.

First, he argues: If the land of a country belongs to the people, to the community of that country, then the land values necessarily must go to the community of that country; this value always goes to the owner as such. Very good. But that "if" is not verified. To maintain, as Mr. George does, that the land of a country belongs to the people of that country as a whole, and not to the individuals who have by some title or other acquired parts of it, is false and heretical.

As to the second reason: the land value is not the product of the individual's labor or investment of capital—we readily grant the statement; but permit us to ask: Is it the product of the community's labor or investment of capital? Evidently it is not; it arises, as our economist himself says, from the growth of the community and from social progress; but how?

The land value of which there is question here, is not an inherent physical quality of the land which makes it better or more fertile and consequently more desirable or more valuable. Hence it is not and need not be produced by the forces of nature nor by any kind of labor. The object being given, its value arises, in-

creases or decreases consequently upon certain extrinsic circumstances that are mere conditions, in somewhat the same way as a good, substantial meal has a greater "value" for a hungry man than for one having little or no appetite. The meal has a producer, but not its value as such; the latter supposes merely an empty stomach.

The actual value (exchange value) of an object is nothing else than its fitness or capacity of being exchanged for other useful objects. This springs from the general estimation of men based on the usefulness of the object to satisfy some want or desire, and on the greater or lesser difficulty of obtaining it.*) Suppose a community on a certain stage of civilization, and you have *ipso facto* certain needs and desires in that community which are to be satisfied. Now suppose, besides, various goods capable of satisfying those wants and desires, and also certain facilities of communication and of intercourse which make the exchange of different objects in that community feasible; then, without any further exertion, labor or production, the various useful objects, whether merchandise or real estate, will, by common estimation, possess a certain exchange value; and this value will for the self-same unchanged object vary, decrease or increase, according as the extrinsic circumstances vary. To whom, then, does the exchange value of such an object belong? Evidently to nobody else than the owner of that object. Being really and truly the owner of the object, of the entire object, he owns it with all that is in it, whether actually or potentially; he owns it with all its usefulness to satisfy the needs and desires of the owner himself, i. e., with its "use value"; he owns it with all its capacity of obtaining by exchange some other good, i. e., with its "exchange value." The exchange value no less than the use value belongs in justice to the owner of the valuable object; he enjoys all the advantage in case of an increase, as he has to bear all the ensuing disadvantage in case of a decrease.

True, this common sense answer does not fit into the arbitrary systems of "modern economists," but it is sound philosophy for all that. It is but an application of the saying, "Res fructificat domino," which is a maxim of natural as well as of positive jurisprudence. He who denies to the owner of an object its exchange value, denies his right of ownership. For what does it mean to say: "This object, e. g., this bicycle, belongs to me, it is mine"? It means, according to all men, that he who can truly say so, has the full, free, and exclusive right of disposing of it and that he can, independently of all others, enjoy the advantages that result for him

*) Cf. A. Vermeersch, S. J., Quaestiones de Justitia. 1901. N. 336. Vera ratio valoris.

from such disposal or use. He may ride on his bicycle for the sake of exercise; he may shut it up in a store-room; he may give it away as a present; he may also, if he chooses, exchange it for some other useful object. If he makes such an exchange, that which he thus acquires becomes as truly and completely his, as was the object with which he parted. To deprive him, therefore, of the whole or of a part of the object acquired, would manifestly be an infringement of the right of property, and to deny him the right to the whole benefit of the exchange, would in reality be to deny or destroy his right of ownership.

Hence it is that mankind's natural sense of justice applies this principle constantly to every species of property. Take a horse dealer who owns two hundred fine horses. Suppose the price of these animals rises for some reason or other; then his gain, which all acknowledge to be truly his, will perhaps be twice as large as it would have been under ordinary circumstances. The owner of a dairy farm will with the same amount of work make greater or smaller gains according as the price of milk, butter, and cheese rises or falls. The exchange value is an economical growth, "increment" or fruit of the object; it belongs, therefore, to the owner of the object no less than the natural fruit of a tree belongs to the owner of the tree. The ownership of an object and the ownership of its fruit are inseparably connected, they include one another. In order to be logically justified in denying the right to the land value, one must necessarily deny the ownership of the land; and in order justly to claim the land value for the community, he must necessarily declare the community to be the universal landlord. This Henry George understood and he was sincere enough to state it publicly. Hence his bold declaration in 'Progress and Poverty': "If private property in land be just, then is the remedy I propose a false one; if, on the contrary, private property in land be unjust, then is this remedy the true one."

But Henry George not only maintains that "confiscating rent" is in accordance with the moral law; he goes still further. He holds it to be the God-intended way of gathering the necessary revenues of the State, and sees, moreover, in the natural provision of this never-failing source of public revenue an admirable proof of the divine wisdom and goodness in behalf of mankind. Let us listen, for a few moments, to his enthusiastic expatiations in the "Open Letter to Pope Leo XIII":

"But, further: that God has intended the State to obtain the revenues it needs by the taxation of land values is shown by the same order and degree of evidence that shows that God has intended the milk of the mother for the nourishment of the babe. [!!]. See how close is the analogy.... See how with the growth of

such [large] cities the one thing that steadily increases in value is land; how the opening of roads, the building of railways, the making of any public improvement, adds to the value of land. Is it not clear that here is a natural law—that is to say a tendency willed by the Creator? Can it mean anything else than that He who ordained the State with its needs has in the values which attach to land provided the means to meet those needs?....

"The Right Reverend Dr. Thomas Nulty, Bishop of Meath, who sees all this as clearly as we do, in pointing out to the clergy and laity of his diocese [April 2nd, 1881] the design of Divine Providence that the rent of land should be taken for the community, says: 'I think, therefore, that I may fairly infer, on the strength of authority as well as of reason, that the people are and always must be the real owners of the land of their country." [The philosophically false and theologically heretical doctrine of common (national) land ownership!] "This great social fact appears to me to be of incalculable importance....There is, moreover, a charm and a peculiar beauty in the clearness with which it reveals the wisdom and benevolence of the designs of Providence in the admirable provision He has made for the wants and the necessities of that state of social existence of which He is author.....A vast public property, a great national fund, has been placed under the dominion and at the disposal of the nation to supply itself abundantly with resources necessary to liquidate the expenses of its government, the administration of its laws, and the education of its youth, and to enable it to provide for the suitable sustentation and support of its criminal and pauper population'....

"There is, indeed, as Bishop Nulty says, a peculiar beauty in the clearness with which the wisdom and benevolence of Providence are revealed in this great social fact, the provision made for the common needs of society in what economists call the law of rent. Of all the evidences that natural religion gives, it is this that most clearly shows the existence of a beneficent God and most conclusively silences the doubts that in our days lead so many to materialism."

These enthusiastic sentiments of Bishop Nulty and Henry George, alas! are like the emotions called forth by the reading of a thrilling novel. They are based on fiction, not on truth and reality. There is no such "vast public property," no such "great national fund"! And there can be none! For, as Leo XIII. in harmony with ancient and modern philosophy has so clearly demonstrated in his grand encyclical which Henry George tried to refute by bold assertions and rhetorical phrases, the welfare of the individual, of the family, and of human society at large demands that temporal goods, land as well as movables, should be divided and

owned severally. Hence God did not give the earth to the whole of mankind as their common property or the land of a country to the nation of that country as a whole, but he wanted the earth to be divided, "leaving the actual distribution of private possessions to men's industry and to the laws of peoples." Such is human nature and such, therefore, are the designs of God's wisdom and benevolence.

The beauty which Bishop Nulty and Henry George admire in the design of "taking the rent of land for the community" or of "raising the public revenues by a single tax on the value of land irrespective of improvements," is no beauty at all, but an insult to justice. For what does the single tax practically mean? It means neither more nor less than this: all taxes are to be paid by those who own land; all others, even if they possess millions, are free from taxes. The injustice of such a system of taxation is so glaring that one must be blinded by prejudice or lacking all notion of equity not to see it. Moreover, that the laying of all taxes on land owners would soon and inevitably ruin agriculture and thus jeopardize all prosperity of nations, is so obvious an inference that the arbitrary and oft-repeated assertions of Henry George to the contrary can not in the least dim its evidence.

THE STORY OF DR. EDWARD PREUSS' CONVERSION.

[As Told by Himself.]

VII.

What made a still deeper impression upon him, was that a portion of the periodical press did not cease to subject both his literary work and his personal experiences to a most bitter criticism.

"He who dares to accuse the immaculately conceived Virgin of sin," observed one of them, "must be a very great sinner himself; for only the impurity of the impure can refuse to recognize the purity of the most pure of God's creatures."

"The delusion that a man is justified by faith alone," remarked another, "can exist only in the brain of those who not only themselves lack good works, but are more or less plentifully supplied with bad ones."

"The fanaticism of 'pure orthodoxy,' so-called," added a third, "is rarely if ever connected with a pure life. He who truly endeavors to lead an unstained life, will find no time to quarrel with others about dogmatic subtleties."

Another scholarly periodical ridiculed that chapter of our Professor's book on the justification wherein he had called sanctifica-

tion the necessary and inevitable concomitant of justification by faith alone, and exclaimed: "Hic Rhodus! Hic salta!"

These then were the undeniable and indestructible results of our Professor's writings and vicissitudes of life.

High up into the clouds he had dreamed that his house, which he imagined was built upon the "eternal foundations of the Word of God," would tower; yet it had collapsed disgracefully!

As a man of reason, who was accustomed to think logically, our Professor now began to meditate upon the reasons for all these things.

Had the divine word of truth, which guarantees indestructible power,—had it really been the foundation of his edifice?

Again he studied the Bible, and particularly the New Testament, with steady reference to this question, so important for his eternal weal or woe.

There he read in more than one passage about houses which had been destroyed by the floods and the winds.

"Every one therefore, that heareth these my words," testifies the Son of God Himself (Matth. vii, 24—27), "and doth them, shall be likened to a wise man that built his house upon a rock; and the rain fell, and the floods came, and they beat upon that house, and it fell not, for it was founded on a rock. And every one that heareth these my words, and doth them not, shall be like a foolish man that built his house upon the sand; and the rain fell, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and they beat upon that house, and it fell, and great was the fall thereof."

The author of the 'Justification of the Sinner Before God' had built his house upon the sand; for he had not "done" the words of Christ; he had fulfilled scarcely a single one of the precepts which the Savior gave in the Sermon on the Mount, and to which he refers when he speaks of "my words." Was it to be wondered at that his whole palace had fallen when the floods and the winds struck it?

"Why call you me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" thus read a parallel passage in the sixth chapter of the Gospel of St. Luke, to which a note referred him.

Indeed, in saying 'Lord, Lord!' the champion of "true orthodoxy" had been surpassed by few; but when it came to doing the words of Christ, he stood far below the poor laboring woman who went to nurse her neighbor.

Again, he read in the Gospel of St. Luke that the house of the man who does not fulfil the precepts of Jesus, lacks foundation, wherefore the flood and the storm shake it and it falls to ruins.

It was surely not for the first time that such a thing had happened; but a more appropriate history of the opponent of the Im-

maculate Conception within briefer space could not possibly have been furnished.

To do; yes, to do; to do the will of God. The whole Bible was full of this.

"He that hath looked into the perfect law of liberty," says St. James (i, 25), "and hath continued therein, not becoming a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed."

Not "in his faith;" nor in "his belief in the forgiveness of sins;" but "in his deed."

And St. John (1. Ep. ii, 17): "The world passeth away and the concupiscence thereof: but he that doth the will of God"—not only believes in the Bible or more specifically in the imputation of the merits of Christ—"abideth forever."

The whole third chapter of the First Epistle of St. John is a detailed and victorious refutation of the *sola fides* theory:

"Whosoever abideth in him (Christ), committeth no sin; and whosoever sinneth, hath not seen him, nor known him."—"Little children, let no man deceive you. He that doth justice is just, even as he is just."

With the order of salvation which he had himself hitherto taught and practiced, our immigrant now compared Acts x, 34 and 35. His idea had been: First comes sin, then penance and faith, and finally acceptance by Christ. But how did Cornelius, according to the testimony of the divinely inspired book, come to be born anew and to possess all the graces which a spiritual rebirth implies? By good works, particularly alms-giving. And St. Peter even drew from this individual case the general rule: "In very deed I perceive, that God is not a respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh justice is acceptable to him." (The Greek text says: "will be accepted by him.")

Had our Professor, instead of writing books, done the will of God in the sense of the seventh chapter of St. Matthew, his house would not have become the prey of the floods and the winds. But alas! he had not even made the modest beginning of Cornelius.

Fortunately, however, it was not yet too late. The strength of youth was still in his veins. He could yet supply what the testimony of God and of experience so clearly showed him that he had hitherto wanted.

To do, to do, to do the word of God! He abandoned all his theories and began to do what the heathen had done whom God received into His grace through St. Peter—follow the precepts aid down in the three chapters of the Sermon on the Mount.

[*To be continued.*]

MINOR TOPICS.

The Closed Shop.—In "Some Aspects of the Labor Question in America," presented at a recent meeting of the British Association by Mr. C. J. Hamilton of University College, Cardiff, the author recalls President Hadley's declaration of last fall, that "within two years there will be the greatest conflict between organized labor and organized capital that the United States has yet seen," and says that it is now in process of verification. The immediate cause of the conflict is the depression of trade, bringing with it wage reductions and an increase in the number of the unemployed. Our labor unions, which, it is asserted, have probably doubled their membership since 1900, are ostensibly fighting against the downward tendency of prices and wages.

But, as the *Nation* points out, this is not the real cause of the struggle. The "closed shop" is what organized labor is just now contending for. The closed shop has not and probably will not actually come. "If it were possible to introduce it, the means employed have so far been wrong in their very essence. As our English critic declares, 'It must come, not by coercion of employer nor of employé, but by establishing the union's claim to be necessary to the worker and not injurious to the employer or the public.' This is a large program, but can it be carried out? There is quite a strong belief that combined capital has more to gain than lose from a perfected organization of labor. Great employers have repeatedly said of late that they were glad to have their men join the unions, as it made bargaining with them easier. Such optimism is, however, to be regarded lightly at this stage of the game; present conditions have existed too short a time to admit of their bearings being seen with any clearness. Any benefit to combined capital from organized labor must spring from more stable conditions in the unions than are yet evident. So far, the injury to the employer and the public has greatly outweighed any benefit which they may have secured. As yet the public feels that both capital and labor often aim at illegitimate ends. The former frequently strives to restrict output, crush competition and artificially raise prices; the latter fights for the degrading of the efficient workman to the level of the lazy and incompetent and the restricting of the number of apprentices, both with the intent of thwarting the natural law of production and wages respectively. Fighting on such lines can never result in permanent victory."

England and the French-Canadians.—In an editorial comment on the (Protestant) Archbishop of Canterbury's visit to Canada, the Boston *Evening Transcript* (Sept. 7th) says:

"In Quebec the primate of England won French-Canadians by dwelling with something deeper than an exquisite urbanity on the heroic virtues displayed in North America by the exploring missionaries of the Church of Rome.....The primate displayed a spirit that has often been evinced by great political Britons visiting the Dominion—the spirit of conciliation, of respect for the feelings of the conquered, of admiration for those deeds in which

they take all the more pride because the later history of their race in the country which their fore-fathers founded has been merged almost indistinguishably with that of the English..... They serve to convey to the French a sense that England is their friend, and not the partisan of that ramping Canadian element which almost incessantly proclaims animosity against the official use of the French tongue, and an Ulsterain desire to make all 'croppies lie down.' Canada may be said to remain in the empire because these people have never been able to convince the French that England would abandon them to local wolves.

"This French reliance on the British of the Old Country, coupled with that distrust of the local British which is due almost wholly to the roaring of Orangemen, is the main obstacle to the independence of the Dominion. Jean Baptiste and his singularly able clergy are unable to trust their laws, language, and cherished institutions to the untramelled legislation of a Parliament in which the English-speaking have a majority of two-thirds. The distrust is not unjustly founded on mere suspicion and fear of the Orangemen. It is but a few years since the English majority in Manitoba deprived the Romanist minority of privileges in education to which they were unquestionably entitled by the spirit of the agreement through which the Northwest Territories were brought into Confederation. Slowly grows a political sect of English Canadians who sincerely wish to protect the French in all their treaty rights and subsequent acquisitions. Slowly grows a French-Canadian school at once inclined to trust English compatriots, and to confidence that the French are politically both numerous and skillful enough to take care of themselves, however joined with other races in an independent Canada."

A Catholic Labor Day in Montreal.—The zealous and progressive Archbishop of Montréal, Msgr. Bruchesi, has succeeded in giving to the annual Labor Day somewhat of the tone and color of a religious holyday. Under date of August 15th he issued through his *Semaine Religieuse* (xliv, 10) a "Letter to the Laboringmen," in which he said among other things: "With all the tenderness of her heart the Church addresses to you the words of her divine Master Jesus Christ: 'Come to me all ye who labor and are burthened, and I will refresh you.' You have confidence in her directions, in the prudence of her counsels, and the justice of her decisions. You glory in being her obedient, respectful, and devoted sons. She blessed your cradle and later on at your request, also your home; it is she who will bless your grave. Above all she desires your eternal happiness; but she also wishes to see you happy here below." For this reason, he continues, the Church instructs the laboringmen in their duties and rights, protects them, so far as in her power lies, against undue oppression, warns them against unjustifiable uprisings, and constantly endeavors to have peace and justice reign supreme. "In a few days, on the first Monday in September, you are going to celebrate your Labor Day. Ask the Church to bless it and God to shower down upon it his most precious graces.... On Sunday, Sept. 4th, at half-past seven o'clock, P. M., I ask you to come to the Cathedral of Notre Dame. The whole vast edifice will be reserved for you.... There I desire

that you join in singing the beautiful canticle which you nearly all know: 'En avant marchons.' There will be an appropriate sermon, followed by an act of consecration to the Sacred Heart and of salutation to the Blessed Sacrament. All the clergy are invited to assist at the demonstration.....I need not add that I shall also be with you. It is thus that you will give to your holiday the truly Christian character which I am sure you desire to give to it, and that you will draw down upon yourselves and your families the favors of Heaven."

The invitation was heeded, and Montréal is the first city upon the American continent that can boast of having celebrated a distinctively Catholic Labor Day.

The Elks Opposed by Decent Protestants.—We note that the *Lutheraner* of this city (lx, 19) denounces the Elks as a society that preeminently "serves the flesh." In proof of its assertion our contemporary quotes a report of a recent Elks' convention in Cincinnati, by a German religious newspaper published there, the *Apologete*. "This order," says the *Apologete*, "consists confessedly of bonvivants, that is to say of men who consider sensual indulgence their chief object in life and desire others to participate therein. Their motto is: Write the faults of your brother in the sand, but his virtues upon the tables of memory and love. That sounds well enough, but can be variously interpreted. The manner in which many of these 'brethren' interpreted it during their stay here, was in the direction of the most unbounded dissipation and shameless debauchery. 'Everything is permitted these days,' was the unblushing excuse of one lewd 'brother' who had insulted a lady in open daylight on one of the public streets. Cincinnati never before witnessed anything like it. All decent citizens were agreed that it was a shame and a humiliation for the community to be obliged to tolerate such scandalous conduct within its walls. After nightfall no woman was safe from insult on the streets. Many young men were drunk, and it is reported that numerous prostitutes were imported during the festival."

Thus far the Cincinnati Protestant journal. To which our own *Lutheraner* adds: "Shall it be permitted to a young man who professes himself a Christian, to belong to such a society?" We understand that the Lutheran Synod does not permit it. And among us Catholics, we are deeply humiliated to be compelled to acknowledge that even some clergymen have joined and still belong to the Elks.

——At the recent meeting of the American Bankers' Association a representative of the bonding companies (whose business is giving security to employers for the honesty of their employés), speaking for all the companies in the country, said, "their losses last year were disastrous, the direct cause being the defalcations of bank clerks." The Philadelphia *Record* of Sept. 17th, commenting editorially on the above statement, says among other things: "The conclusion can hardly be avoided that there has been a remarkable decline in the integrity of young men." Well, most of the young men now-a-days are products of our "celebrated" public school system. which lately has also been forced upon the poor

people of Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines. Many "scientific" branches are taught in these "model" institutions, but the Ten Commandments or even common honesty are not on the list. Is it any wonder that the standard of morality is being lowered all over the land?

If the friends of Christian education need any more telling arguments than they have used so far, they might find them in the statistics of the fidelity companies of the Union, since the experience of these concerns touches the average American's most vital spot: his pocket-book.

——Here is "a case of conscience" which the *Independent* (No. 2911) refers in its very peculiar editorial English "to those who are wise":

"There was a smoke seen issuing from one of the entrances to the new subway in this city. As it increased the crowd gathered so close that the police could not beat them back to make room for the fire engines that were coming. Then one of the policemen shouted out, 'Back there, for your lives! There's half a ton of dynamite below!' and the crowd ran back, and there was no dynamite. Now, when he makes confession to the priest, what sort of a penance would an expert in 'moral philosophy' impose?"

We are not a clergyman, nor do we count ourselves among the wise. But we are quite sure, nevertheless, if the policeman would bring this matter up in confession, it would be a question not of "moral philosophy," but theology. However, it is not likely that Pat will bring it up. We must suppose, so long as there is no evidence to the contrary, that he acted in good faith and really believed there was dynamite in the subway. *Nemo mendax habetur nisi probetur.* Then again it may be that the cry rose to his lips in the excitement of the moment, without any intention on his part to tell a lie or to stretch the truth. But even if he had deliberately prevaricated, though he may be fully conscious of having done wrong—for a lie is a lie and never permissible—it is not at all certain that he would mention it to his confessor, because policemen, we believe, are not usually men who make much of what they know to be at worst only venial sins.

——Rev. Dr. D. J. McMahon, of New York, in an address to the international conference of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, on Sept. 27th, warned the members against the all-pervading spirit of secularism. The Protestants, he said among other things, are ahead of us in nearly all lines of charitable endeavor. We should learn from their methods how to obtain the best results with the means available, in the care for the family at home and of the needy outside, for institutions and delinquency. But we should strenuously guard against the tendency of divorcing religion from charity. As in education, so in charity, secularism is to-day everywhere rampant. But religion can not be divorced from charity. Charity without religion can never be true charity. That they be ever joined intimately together, should be the zealous care of all Catholic charity workers, especially of the members of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul.

——Mr. J. W. Maguire, of Providence, R. I., in a paper read before the international conference of the St. Vincent de Paul So-

ciety, recently held here in St. Louis, called attention to the Catholic Home for Working Boys existing in Providence, which he termed a unique institution. It was founded some years ago under the auspices of the local St. Vincent de Paul Society for the purpose of furnishing a home to boys of from twelve to twenty-one years, especially those dismissed from the Catholic orphan asylum. It is under the management of a Catholic gentleman and a matron, and besides doing much good, has proved almost entirely self-supporting. All honest boys willing to conform to the rules of the Home are admitted, and if they have no occupation, the director provides them with a suitable one. Each inmate pays a small sum for board and lodging, and if there is any excess in his earnings turned over to the manager, it is deposited to his credit in a savings bank and paid out when the owner becomes of age. This is a useful institution, and we ought to have more of the same kind in all our large cities.

——Msgr. Dougherty of Nuova Segovia and Msgr. Rooker of Jaro disputed each other's right of precedence and carried the case before the S. Congregation of Rites. Both had been consecrated on the same day, June 14th, 1903, at Rome, one in the church of Sts. John and Paul, the other in the chapel of the American College. The Bishop of Nuova Segovia claimed precedence because his consecration began at seven o'clock, whilst the consecration of the Bishop of Jaro began only at eight. The Bishop of Jaro founded his claim on the fact that he had been preconized before his brother of Nuova Segovia. After hearing both sides, the S. Congregation, in accordance with previous decisions, declared that the one first proposed and confirmed in the Consistory had the right of precedence. *Lieb Vaterland magst ruhig sein!*

——Rev. Dr. Charles Maignen is at present in Rome to push the cause of the beatification of Pius IX., in which he is so deeply interested. He informs us, under date of Sept. 12th, that the *Vérité Française* alone has collected more than 80,000 signatures to the petition which has been addressed to the Holy See for the opening of the canonical process. Of these 80,000 a little over 3,000 are from the United States. As we have already noted, the movement is viewed very favorably by Pope Pius X. and the matter will doubtless be taken up soon if petitions continue to pour in from Catholics all over the world. Those wishing to advance the good cause may address themselves to *La Vérité Française*, Paris, France.

——St. Nicholas (German) Catholic Church, located in the heart of the great East Side district in New York, is preparing to meet the tenement question in a practical manner. It has filed plans for a six-story flat-house, which will be erected on a generous plan; it will have accommodation for twenty-four families, and will, it is needless to remark, be conducted along lines quite different from those which have made the tenement-house evil such a fester-spot on the metropolis. The experiment will be watched with interest, and its success no doubt will lead to a repetition in many quarters.—Buffalo *Catholic Union and Times*, xxxiii, 24.

——"We are pleased to learn from the *Church Progress*"—says the *Monitor*—"that the St. Louis Fair is remarkable for the absence of everything offensive to good morals. There is, we are told, nothing about the great aggregation upon which the eye of innocence may not gaze. Is the widely advertised 'Pike' included in the inventory?" And the *Church Progress* answers (vii, 7): "Unhesitatingly and unequivocally, yes. To meet Sisters on the 'Pike' is not uncommon."

When a certain Catholic bishop had "done" the "Pike," he was asked: "What do you think of it?"—"There is work for the St. Vincent de Paul Society."—"How so?" he was asked. "Clothing the naked," he replied.

——The fine, strong character of the late Dr. Preuss, of St. Louis, is shown in a sketch of his life in the September *Messenger*. While a Lutheran, Dr. Preuss took upon himself to oppose the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, then just promulgated. To make his position strong, he hunted for all the facts and proofs in his own keen, bold way. Like all searchers for truth who are sincere, he found it, and became not only a Catholic, but a champion of the Immaculate Conception. The story of his conversion is a grand tribute of praise to Mary Immaculate.—N. Y. *Freeman's Journal*, No. 3711.

——Archbishop Glennon, in one of his addresses to the international conference of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, told the members that their Society is oftenest mentioned and praised in the New Testament. Not indeed by name; but all the blessings pronounced by the Saviour upon the charitable, apply in a particular manner to the disciples of St. Vincent, because the principal and sole object of their union is the full and unselfish practice of that charity which the Master so often praised and commanded.

——In this year of the golden jubilee of the Immaculate Conception it is pleasing to recall that the first chapel erected to God in the British American provinces, St. Mary's of Philadelphia, was dedicated to the Immaculate Conception, then not yet dogmatically defined, and that when Father Marquette built the first chapel in this Western country, at Kaskaskia, Ill., it was also dedicated to Mary Immaculate. (Cfr. *American Catholic Historical Researches*, 1893, x, 1).

——This editorial note from the Philadelphia *Record* of Sept. 17th is good:

"The Japanese and Russian commanders are by no means singular in their evident desire to understate the extent of their losses in battle. The people of the United States never even guessed at the extent of injury done the Union forces in the Civil War, until the pension lists were made up years afterward."

——The editor of THE REVIEW is deeply interested in everything pertaining to the history of the Catholic periodical press in the United States and requests his readers to furnish him with whatever information they may possess on this subject.